New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News, Editorials—Advertisements

Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1921

Owned by New York Tribune, Inc., a New York Corporation. Published daily. Ogden Reid, President; G. Vernon Rogers, Vice-President; Helen Rogers Reid, Secretary; R. E. Maxfield, Treasurer. Address, Tribune Building, 154 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone, Beekman 3000.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES — By mail, including Postage. IN THE UNITED STATES.

	One Year	Six Months	One Month
By Mail, Postpaid.			
Daily and Sunday..... One week, 30c.	$12.00	$6.00	$1.00
Daily only..... One week, 25c.	10.00	5.00	.85
Sunday only	4.00	2.25	.40
Sunday only, Canada.....	6.00	3.25	.55
FOREIGN RATES			
Daily and Sunday.....	$36.00	$18.00	$2.40
Daily only	17.40	8.70	1.45
Sunday only	9.75	5.12	.80

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

GUARANTY

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for republication of all news dispatches credited to it or not otherwise credited in this paper, and also the local news of spontaneous origin published herein.

All rights of republication of all other matter herein also are reserved.

Hearst by Proxy

"This is not a fight of Republican against Democrat. The fight is one of Republicans, Democrats and the non-partisan voters of New York against William Randolph Hearst, of California."

That is the meat in the nut of this campaign, and the leader of the coalition forces does well to emphasize it. And Mr. Curran might well have added that a vote for Hylan to-morrow could be as effectively cast for the jellyfish which Hearst, with his manikin for a tearful audience, rescued on the sands of Palm Beach in the spring of 1918.

Debarred by public opinion from holding office himself, Hearst can satisfy the overweening ambition of his life, amounting almost to an obsession, only by proxy. That is all there is left to him.

In his time Hearst has supported many men for public office, but never in twenty-five years has he succeeded in controlling one as long as he has Hylan. Once, having been repudiated as a candidate for Governor by the people of the state, he assumed to have discovered a proxy in that office in Alfred E. Smith. But Smith would not grovel at Hearst's feet, and for his rebellion he had to suffer such a crucifixion at the hands of the Hearst printing presses as few men in public life have undergone.

Tortured beyond endurance, the former Governor turned, and the memory of New York is short, indeed, if it does not recall the mass meeting at Carnegie Hall on the night of October 29, 1919.

Mr. Smith challenged Hearst to meet him in debate on that occasion, and Hearst, true to form, refused.

Said Smith to 4,000 people:

> "Of course, I am here alone. I knew I would be, because I knew the man to whom I issued the challenge, and I know that he has not got a drop of clean, good red blood in his body. I know the color of his liver. And I know it is whiter than the driven snow, if such a thing is possible."

As if to prove all that Mr. Smith had said, Hearst suddenly ceased his attacks, and as the campaign closed declared for his re-election for Governor.

And to-day Mr. Smith, true to the traditions of Tammany Hall "regularity," asks New York to believe that Hylan has made "mistakes," but only "through the impulses of an honest heart."

The former Governor is now for Hearst's manikin, his proxy. Are you willing to accept his testimony as to Hearst in 1919 or his testimony as to Hylan in 1921? In 1919 he was speaking for himself. This year he must speak for Tammany.

Normal Wheat Crops Again

Encouraging progress toward normalcy is indicated in the wheat crop estimates. This year's yield of twenty-nine countries, not including Russia, will be 2,852,825,000 bushels. This is about 190,000,000 bushels more than last year's. Touching the most important of all food crops, the world has practically got back to its ante-bellum standard of production.

In the five years from 1908 to 1912, inclusive, the wheat crop of the entire world ranged from 3,182,000,000 to 3,759,000,000 bushels, the average being 3,527,000,000. That included Russia and various minor countries not comprised in this year's estimates. The Russian crop varied greatly, ranging from 422,000,000 to 690,000,000 bushels, its average being about 527,000,000. Deducting it from the total of the world, we have an average remainder of 3,000,000,000. That is only 148,000,000 more than this year's estimate from twenty-nine countries, an amount which may well be made up by the countries not included in the twenty-nine, but included in the former statistics.

The one obstacle to the restoration of normal conditions in breadstuffs, then, is Russia. In former years it generally produced a large surplus of wheat and was able to export large quantities to other countries. This year, because of the deviltries of Sovietism, it is not producing enough for home consumption, and is looking to the rest of the world for large supplies to save the people from starvation. To what extent that circumstance will affect the general bread supply of the world remains to be seen. It will probably not be affected seriously, and if the favorable outlook now reported for next year's crop is realized, 1922 may see the bread supply of the world, quite independently of Russia, fully restored to the standard of before the war.

The Amendments

Seven amendments to the state constitution are to be voted on to-morrow.

Amendment No. 1 extends the civil service preference granted to veterans of the Civil War to include all who have served in the army, the navy or the Marine Corps in time of war. It gives veterans priority in appointment and promotion without regard to their standing on any list of eligibles. This amendment lets in those who were in the non-combatant as well as the combatant branches. It would lead to a practical monopolization of classified government employment by veterans able to pass an examination, and would thus virtually end what is known as the merit system of appointments. It is much too sweeping in its scope and should not be adopted.

Amendment No. 2 increases the salaries of state Senators and Assemblymen from $1,500 to $3,000. A similar proposition was defeated a few years ago. This is no time to raise official salaries. The amendment should be defeated.

All the other amendments are praiseworthy. No. 3 provides that after January 1 next no person shall become entitled to vote by attaining majority or by naturalization unless able to read and write English, except because of physical disability. It is absurd to bestow the franchise on any person so little interested in public affairs as to neglect to learn to read and write the language of the country. Americanization would be advanced by a requirement that electors shall at least be competent to read their own ballots.

Amendment No. 4 allows the counties of Westchester and Nassau to reorganize their local governmental machinery, if they see fit to do so.

Amendment No. 5 permits children's courts and courts of domestic relations to be established on a broader basis. These tribunals perform an important service, but have been hampered by many restrictions. They are no longer an experiment and deserve the fullest public support.

Amendments Nos. 6 and 7 authorize the Legislature to sell the portion of the old Erie Canal lying between Rome and Mohawk and the portion of the same canal lying between Mohawk and the Herkimer and Oneida County line. They are intended to dispose of property no longer essential to the operation of the state canal system.

Vote against Amendments Nos. 1 and 2 and for Amendments No. 3 to 7.

The Senate's Duty

It is well that the incredible charges lodged by Senator Watson against the character of the American Expeditionary Forces are to be investigated.

While Mr. Watson may not be called to account outside the precincts of Congress for the statements he has made, he, nevertheless, is answerable to the Senate—as answerable as was Blanton, of Texas, to the House—and in turn the Senate is answerable to the public opinion of the country.

Either Mr. Watson's allegation that officers in France murdered enlisted men for insolence is true or it is untrue. Either his allegation that soldiers were legally murdered—that is, executed without the right of trial by court martial—is true or it is untrue. Either his allegation that too many of our nurses, "not all, but too many," were debauched by expeditionary officers is true or it is untrue.

It is up to the Senate to establish the truth or falsity of these allegations. Law still prevails. There is nothing in our civil or military codes which bars by time limitation a prosecution for murder.

Plainly the Senate has a grave duty to perform. Let it proceed with the least possible delay.

Disarming the Kitchens

The official table of the organizations of the infantry of the United States as published by the Leavenworth War College sets out that each company shall have four cooks. Appended is the following note:

> "Decision that the four cooks are to be armed with pistols only is made by the school authorities and will govern until decided by higher authority."

So the limitation of armament principle is already applied in our army. Formerly a cook, as an enlisted man, carried a rifle. Now it is to have only an automatic pill box. Yet the limitation may be of military consequence. It will be recalled that in one important battle in the late war, when the men in the regular line had rapidly executed a strategic retirement, the cooks emerged from amid their pots and pans and most gallantly repelled the enemy.

If rifles are withheld, why are pistols provided? Can it be that the idea is to weapon the cooks only enough to subdue grouching doughboys into eating what is served to them? Or is the cook's pistol to be merely a defensive instrument, by flourishing which kitchens are to be held when those indignantly dissatisfied with the "chow" start trouble?

Another thing is not made clear—namely, the question whether in the military establishments of other countries there is a similar limitation. Have we acted without waiting for the Washington conference to get an agreement?

The Borough Presidents

The five Borough Presidents have votes in the Board of Estimate and Apportionment. It is important that as many anti-Hylan candidates as possible shall be elected as borough heads. In Manhattan, now represented on the board by Major Curran, Ernest F. Eilert, a business man of high standing, is the coalition candidate. He is a publisher and served a term on the Board of Education. He is pledged to a "business administration" of the borough's affairs. His opponent, Julius Miller, was nominated after a bitter fight in the Tammany ranks. He is Murphy's personal choice. He ought to be defeated as such.

In the Bronx Joseph M. Levine, a lawyer and active civic worker, is running on the coalition ticket against Henry Bruckner, the present Borough President. The latter is one of the cogs in the Hylan city machine. In Brooklyn George W. Baker, also conspicuous in civic activities, is a candidate against the incumbent, Edward Riegelmann, a Hearst-Hylan lieutenant.

Maurice E. Connolly, President of Queens, has long been a conspicuous figure in the turmoil of that borough's politics. He belongs to the old order there. His coalition opponent, Edgar F. Hazleton, stands for a new deal and a higher-grade administration. In Richmond George Cromwell, former Borough President and long a power in the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, is the coalition nominee. Mr. Cromwell has been Staten Island's foremost citizen. He is opposed by Matthew J. Cahill, the head of the Richmond Democratic organization.

In all these borough contests the coalition candidates deserve to win because they measure up much better to the standards to which a city administration, to be clean and efficient, must conform.

Holland at the Conference

Holland will not participate in the armament discussions — Secretary Hughes in his invitation limited Dutch participation to the discussion of the problems of the Far East—but as one of the conferees on the Pacific question she may play no mean rôle.

The United States has been territorially interested in the Far East only since the acquisition of the Philippines. The Netherlands have held the East Indies since the early 1600s, and long before the conference nations were concerned with the China trade Dutch merchantmen were carrying the goods of the Indies in their bottoms. Holland to-day controls Sumatra, Java, Borneo, the Celebes, New Guinea and the Old Spice Islands. The territory extends from the Indian Ocean into the Pacific for a distance about as far as from New York to San Francisco. In it reside some 50,000,000 subjects of the Dutch state, who raise large quantities of the world's most important tropical products.

In these islands, which lie next to our own Philippines, the Dutch have practised the same policy of the open door which we are so anxious to preserve in China. And while most of the trade of the Dutch East Indies with Asia (exclusive of India) is done through the two British ports of Singapore and Hong Kong, Holland is nevertheless interested in fair play for all nations in China as a whole. Holland believes in the open-door policy and likewise wants free cable communications. As part owner of the cable from Yap to the East Indies she has a special interest in the ultimate settlement of the Yap question.

The really significant part to be played by Holland, however, is as a sort of moderator and adviser. Her centuries of experience add prestige to her judgment on the problems of the Pacific, and her long association with the movement for world peace gives strength to her counsel.

A Grievous Oversight

The subways are having more than their share of publicity these days. How does it happen that a certain—or should we say the one and only—champion of the people has overlooked this opportunity to brand the interests with their nefarious part in this deplorable state of affairs? The subways have been the scene of little disturbances of the masses. Fuses have blown out. The lights have flickered. The speeding trains have even lurched, and in so lurching one train cast one young lady into the lap of another and precipitated a free-for-all that landed three innocent damsels in the courthouse.

It speaks badly for a city to be dominated by such powers of evil as is New York. Every honest man and woman of the people knows that the interests could prevent a train from lurching by straightening out the tracks, and that the interests put on curves for the express purpose of flouncing straphanging young ladies into the laps of the sitting minority. It is part of a conspiracy to oppress the public.

In the interest of the people, should not the man who is for the people and against the interests take action to denounce this evil? What right has the "bought" press, even when speaking of curved subway tracks, to repeat the notorious falsehood that "that which is crooked cannot be made straight"?

Veterans' Preference

Its Evil Effects on All Branches of Government

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I do not believe that the true significance of the proposed veterans' amendment to the constitution has been clearly brought before the voters. For many years and against heavy odds a struggle has been going on in this country to replace the spoils system of Andrew Jackson's day by the merit system. The proposed amendment is an entering wedge of the spoilsmen and strikes a blow at civil service reform by creating a privileged class and placing at the head of the list all veterans who barely succeed in passing a civil service examination, irrespective of their fitness.

There are plenty of veterans to fill all the civil service vacancies for a long time. In fact, there are over three veterans in this state for each position. Clearly, therefore, the examinations would become an empty formality. No one but a veteran would have a chance of appointment. The result would be an inefficient government, and an inefficient government means an expensive government.

During the war our policemen and firemen were requested to do everything possible to keep out of the service in order that these essential branches of our local government might not be interrupted. Teachers, mostly women, who could not serve in the armed forces during the war, continued to do their duty to their country in the schools. If this amendment passes, promotion will be barred to every one of these loyal men and women. The teacher who has served long and faithfully will find that she cannot hope to become principal or vice-principal, no matter how high his or her passing mark may be, if any war veteran succeeds in getting a mark of 70 per cent. Policemen and firemen will likewise find barely qualified men of scarcely any experience placed over their heads in responsible positions.

The amendment would practically exclude from the public service all those who were too old to fight during the war or all those who were too young. Thirty or forty years from now there will be many war veterans left. The civil service will be practically closed to young blood. We will have police departments, fire departments and school departments consisting of old men whose sole qualification is that they were in uniform. What this would mean to the service is perfectly obvious. Women would have almost no chance of appointment, and there are many positions, notably in the schools and in the charities departments, for which women are especially qualified.

The amendment is not even just to those who served. Its benefits extend to:

1. Clerical workers in uniform, such as the thousands of men who did office work for the navy at 280 Broadway.

2. Men of the students' army training corps, who did not even leave their colleges.

3. Men who were drafted just before the armistice and who were honorably discharged immediately after.

4. All men who entered in the army, navy and Marine Corps after the signing of the armistice and until the ratification of the peace treaty by the Senate only a few weeks ago.

It does not apply to:

1. Army nurses, who saw the most dangerous service in France.

2. Red Cross nurses.

3. Ambulance drivers.

Further than that, it is not beneficial to disabled veterans, for in order to enter the civil service they must pass a physical examination. Most disabled veterans will not be able to meet with this requirement.

The question before the voters therefore is:

Are you going to permit this assault on civil service reform?

Are you satisfied with 70 per cent government?

Are you satisfied with a 70 per cent Police Department?

Are you satisfied with a 70 per cent Fire Department?

Are you satisfied with a 70 per cent education for your children?

Are you ready to create an undemocratic and un-American class of military office holders?

I had the privilege of serving as a member of the American Expeditionary Forces in France. There seems to be some doubt as to just what we fought for. I know I did not fight for any such thing as this amendment. Its passage would be a calamity to the state and to the nation.

A. W. ROTHSCHILD.

New York, Nov. 4, 1921.

Mussels

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The discussion on "mussels" sent me to Webster's Dictionary, where I fould the bivalve spelled both ways, the illustration being with "muscle." The dictionary is an old one, the one furnished to Tribune readers many years ago, edition of 1875.

When I was a child in Bridgeport, Conn., my mother used to cook mussels often, to the great satisfaction of the family, and I supposed they were a product of salt water. I wonder if the fresh water mussels are edible.

AN OLD READER.

Plainfield, N. J., Nov. 2, 1921.

The Conning Tower

MARAH OF OLD DEERFIELD

ACROSS a hundred leagues of snow
From Canada stole down
Red men and white, and ere the light
They took the sleeping town.

Scarce one hour high the winter sun
Had climbed, that bitter day,
When toward the north they hastened forth
To the hard homeward way.

They huddled on the captive folk
Along the heavy trail,
Nor high again the sun stood when
The weak began to fail.

And little Marah Carter then
Was first of all to die:
Her step grew slow—an Indian's blow
Felled her without a cry.

Some walked the trail to Canada,
And their old fields forgot;
Some passed their lives as savage wives,
Contented with their lot.

Some from long months of loneliness
Came straggling back, and found
No crops to reap save many a heap
Of ashes on the ground.

But Marah saw not Canada,
Harsh ways no more she trod;
She gained ways meet for childhood's feet,
And saw the face of God.

A hatchet's stroke—and she was spared
All strokes fate held in store;
Who would give tears that her three years
Attained not to three-score?

G. S. B.

Since the coltish rejuvenescence of The Bookman under the editorship of twenty-five-year-old Mr. John Farrar, its name, Old Frank Hackett thinks, should be changed to The Bookboy.

Gotham Gleanings

—Ray Ives is back from Cuba permanently.

—Washington is the "mecca" of all this week.

—Benning Miller of Harvard was in town yesterday.

—Jack Siddall made an important literary deal Wednesday eve hey sid?

—C. D. Williams entertained Rube Goldberg and others Friday eve'g.

—A. B. Sullivan and wife are sailing for France next Sat. to be gone at least 3 mos.

—Jay Darling the popular and genial cartoonist is well again and back "on the job."

—Harry Mencken Wednesdayed in our midst and nearly invited ye scribe to Baltimore.

—Irv Eisler is now running the drug store on 104th Street and Broadway. Success, Irv.

—They are going to give the Vassar Follies at Town Hall Nov. 15 and a lovely girl wants us to say something about it, but for the life of us we don't know what to say.

They have a strong case, the advocates of rhymeless verse, in saying that much of rhymed verse would be different if unfettered. Just now we are thinking of Annabel Lee, and how, if her name had been Annabel Fry, Poe would have written

But we loved with a love that was more than love,
I and my Annabel Fry,
With a love that the winged seraphs of heaven
Coveted her and I.

The Medicine Show

F. P. A.: Almost extinct is the Patent Medicine chap who traveled with his own negro minstrel troupe of one, but memory brings back an echo of the distinguished gentleman's harangue, made under the flickering glare of the kerosene torch on Courthouse Square, in any Georgia village:—

"Gather a littul closer, good people (now you small boys . . . run along home), for I bring you a messige from that far Western reservation of the Indian country known as Sweet Rivur. As a boy of fifteen my father doctored them redskins, curing them of their fatal diseases. They called him 'Unka-Boola-Facila,' which, translated, ladies and gentlemen, means 'The Great White Healer.'

"This wonder-ful Pre-scription (don't climb on them wagin wheels, son) was handed down to my father by a venerable Cheroky chief, who discovered it while digging for roots-an'-erbs. Have you, I ast—have you chilblains, rheumatism, weak back, fiery dots before th' eyes, suddin dizziness, nuralygia, sore gums, or heart affliction?

"Be patiunt, people. In a few moments my own minstrel troop will entertain you with banjo and songs. In the meanwhile, if you suffer frum chron-ic indygestshun, hardenin' of the arteries, sci-atticy,"—etc., etc.

The kerosene torch burns brightly. The tall, gaunt Medicine Man, in his shiny black coat and his luxuriant felt sombrero, from beneath the wilting brim of which white, curly hair tumbles, points a warning finger. All of man's inherent, human frailty looks out from the wide eyes of the crowd as 200 yellow faces tilt upward.

W. LIVINGSTON LARNED.

News from Texas about the incorporation of the Maxwelton Beer Co. leaves no chance for speculation as to the quality of its brews.

His favorite character in fiction is Thackery's Jean Valjean.—Oneonta Star.

At last the omnivorous reader.

To-morrow and Friday will be holidays, which is good news to all patriotic golfers.

Reprinted by request: Hylan Farewell. F. P. A.

"IT WALKS, IT TALKS, IT SAYS 'PAPA'!"

Copyright, 1921, New York Tribune Inc.

Books

By Percy Hammond

A correspondent, H. R. Harvey, writes in mild protest against the presence in recent fiction of such bores as Miss May Sinclair's Mr. Waddington of Wyck. It is difficult, he thinks, to be patient with dullards so egregious. "The root of their troubles," he writes, "is an absence of a sense of humor, and, in consequence, they weary us. When we should be thinking of their distress our thoughts turn to their stupidity, and in the end we regard them with aversion rather than with interest."

* * *

Mr. Harvey's ennui is caused, perhaps, by his inexpert attitude toward a bore in a book. He regards the tediousness of a bore in a novel as an intimate, personal infliction, forgetting that the dull fellow is not tiring him but the other characters in the story. To enjoy a bore one should put one's self aloof from him, onlooking and eavesdropping from a distance. Few things are more amusing than propinquity to one of these pests when he is making of himself a nuisance to one's friends. You hear the boding sound of his creaking footsteps as he approaches, and you move to an adjoining table, chuckling to yourself as you observe thereafter the agony of those you have left behind for him to talk to. Mr. Wemyss in "Vera" is a frightful bore to other members of his club. They evade him as a pestilence; but you who are permitted to scrutinize him in all his aspects find in the several avenues of his character extraordinary adventures. "We regard them with aversion, rather than with interest," complains the correspondent. Is there, then, Mr. Harvey, no pleasure in aversions? I recommend them to you as the most salubrious of recreations.

* * *

Philip Courthope in E. F. Benson's "Lovers and Friends" is an amusing bore. Though he has little to do with the polite tale told by Mr. Benson, he is, in the formula of the theater, the comedy interest of the book. He is fifty or threabouts, and he is endowed with an income by his American wife, who from afar has almost as much fun with him as you have. He is the beau of Merriby, an English watering place; the president of the local Lovers of Italy Club, secretary of the Opera in Our Own Language Coterie, and treasurer of the Friends of the Suburban Landscape. Upon the effervescent life of Merriby he exercises an undisputed if somewhat mincing authority. He is enamored of the French tongue, and his devastating conversational vacuities are emphasized by conventional French words. He says *tres* instead of "very," and *bon jour* and *en famille* are ever on his lips. The name of his house is *Chez-Moi*, and the parties he gave therein are called *soirees d'ennui*. In a way he reminds you of a Chicago lady similarly addicted. Describing to a friend the details of a social *contretemps* in that neighborhood, she said to him: "Do you understand French?" He replied that he did. "Well, then," she proceeded, "it was simply *terrible*."

* * *

Mr. Courthope's shirt, his views on Russia, his tennis, his golf, are sufficient to turn life for him in a sort of innocent, everlasting and entrancing orgy. His liver, his earaches, his mashie shots, his balance at the bank, are, to him, cosmic. At one of his *soirees d'ennui* his face resembled a spurious Vandyck; he was a middle-aged bel-homme, and his clothes and manners were those of some farcical troubadour. . . . Velveteen knickerbockers, green stockings, flowing tie. . . . He twanged his tennis racket in the manner of a guitar, and sang the first line of the toreador's song out of 'Carmen.'"

* * *

You enjoy Mr. Benson's Courthope, no doubt, because the type is familiar—he is more recognizable than the other figures in "Lovers and Friends." These include his brilliant, beautiful and prudent daughter Celia, who is married to a dependable under secretary, but who is in love with a magnetic, entertaining and selfish member of Parliament. Celia's objection to her husband is that he regards her as perfect. If she says that it is a wet morning he thinks she has marvelous perceptions. If she makes ill-tempered remarks he tells her that she is a pearl of incisiveness. He treats her as a Madonna in a painted window, in a blue robe and with seven stars in her hair. "I want to be tamed," she cries, "like the Shrew!"

But all he does is to kneel to her and to say, "You're wonderful!" or the English equivalent for that familiar remark of American romance. He is the most pernicious sort of bore, because while having no sense of humor himself he inspires others with none. Of late I have been making a collection of the ways in which young wives is novels tell their husbands the Great Secret. Most often it is done by gesture and implication—an embrace and some embarrassed asterisks, thus: * * * Celia, however, is forthright and ceremonial. "Bernard," she said. "I learned it only yesterday. . . . I am going to bear you a child!"

Amendment No. 5

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: May we call the attention of your readers to the importance of Constitutional Amendment No. 5, which is to be voted upon at the election next Tuesday? This amendment is important because it will make possible the removal of a limitation upon our Children's Court, a limitation that has seriously hampered the court's work.

Under our present constitution the Children's Court has no equity powers. No matter what the reasons may be for taking a child to this court, the judge is compelled to follow the practice of trying it as a criminal, under the provisions of the penal code. He has no authority to commit it to any kind of custodial care other than that of an institution.

Children are frequently brought to the court on account of neglect, destitution or cruelty. They are in no sense criminals. The amendment, if adopted, will open the way for legislation that will empower the Children's Court to appoint guardians for these children and reach and punish parents who are delinquent in the performance of their duties.

The spirit of this amendment is to put the Children's Court in a position to give the child greater protection outside of an institution.

ROBERT VAN IDERSTINE,
Chairman New York Child Welfare Committee.

New York, Nov. 4, 1921.

Armistice Day Singers

None Who Went Overseas Chosen to Honor the Unknown Soldier?

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: On November 11 the United States and representatives from all the Allied nations will assemble at Arlington to do honor to our unknown war hero. Each country has sent its most noted participant in the war; General Pershing has selected a superhero; every relief organization is sending its most distinguished worker. Each person concerned in this great ceremony is distinguished for personal achievements in that great struggle except four singers—Rosa Ponselle, Jeanne Gordon, Morgan Kingston, William Gustafson.

When the country sent out its call for volunteers to go "over there" the Y. M. C. A. came forward and said "We will do it for you." The government accepted this offer, stipulating only that these volunteers should be 100 per cent American—real Americans—the kind whose fathers and grandfathers had fought for this great country since its infancy.

What happened? Thousands offered to give up their homes, their ambitions, their livelihood, their lives, perhaps, for this great privilege, that this unknown hero might go to that great beyond with a song in his heart. And now, when he comes to his last resting place, whose final song does he hear? That courageous "Y" boy or girl, of long American ancestry, who sang through all hazards, night and day, with that one desire to give all and more than all, in order that those lads should be happy? No! He is "honored" by a quartet from the Metropolitan Opera House, from whose ranks only one felt the call of his country—Ordynsky—a Pole.

Out of 1,064 men and women who went over to go hand in hand with our fighting men wherever they went has one been selected to sing for him here, as they sang for them there?

Such names as Grace Kerns, Kate Horisberg, Edna Thomas, Elsie Janis, Lois Ewell, Crystal Walters, Francis Rogers, Albert Wiederholt, Inez Wilson, Grace and Frances Hoyt and Margaret Woodrow Wilson—a few of the hundreds who faced many times that grim specter, loss of voice, health, perhaps life! Did they hesitate? I answer from my own experience, No! We only asked for more to do.

MRS. GOODRICH TRUMAN SMITH.

New York, Nov. 5, 1921.

Flags Out on Election Day

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: During the war citizens hung out their flags from the windows on every possible occasion. War is abnormal. Peace is normal. In peace times Election Day is the most important public day of the civil year.

Let New York's good citizens make Election Day a bright, joyous day. Hang out your flags on Election Day. Let Election Day be flagful, colorful, cheerful.

GEORGE HYMAN.

New York, Nov. 4, 1921.

A Handsome Offer

(From The Toronto Globe)

We are willing to name one of the Georgian Bay islands St. Helena if thereby it is made more prison-like for ex-Emperor Karl. His presence would greatly increase the attraction the district has for summer visitors from Ohio and Pennsylvania who wonder why they never see royalty in Canada.